

REMARKS

The Office Action of June 11, 2007, has been carefully considered. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful review of the claims and the useful suggestions. The suggested corrections have been made.

Rejections Based on 35 USC § 102

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 72, 73, and 75 USC § 102 as anticipated by Rudwick (US 4,280,581) Claim 1 has been herein amended to include the limitations of:

a motor sprocket rotationally fixed to said rotatable assembly of said motor, wherein the motor sprocket rotates with a same angular velocity at all times as the rotatable assembly in both a clockwise direction and in a counter clockwise direction during all operation of the electric drive vehicle; and
a uni-directional drive connecting said motor sprocket and said pedal crank assembly for transferring rotary motion from said pedal crank to said motor sprocket, but not from said motor sprocket to said pedal crank,

Rudwick discloses a moderate speed (2,500 to 3,500 RPM) motor with a gear reducer 3 and an overriding clutch 13 between the gear reducer and sprocket 15 (corresponding to the motor sprocket of the present invention). The gear reducer 13 is required because of the moderate RPM motor, and the overriding clutch 13 is required because of the inefficiencies for attempting to drive the moderate RPM motor 2 of Rudwick through the reducer gears 3, and thus preventing turning the motor 2 by the pedals 16.

The herein amended Claim 1 describes a motor sprocket rotationally fixed to the rotatable assembly of the motor at all times in clockwise and counterclockwise rotation, thus always turning at the same angular velocity as the motor, and a uni-directional drive connecting said motor sprocket and said pedal crank assembly, thereby allowing

the motor to be driven by the pedal crank. Because Claim 1 includes these fundamental elements not present in Rudwick, the Applicant believes that the herein amended Claim 1 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 and advance Claim 1 to allowance.

Claims 2, 4, 72, 73, and 75 depend from Claim 1. Because the Applicant believes that the herein amended Claim 1 is in condition for allowance, the Applicant also believes that Claims 2, 4, 72, 73, and 75 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that Claims 2, 4, 72, 73, and 75 be advanced to allowance.

Rejections Based on 35 USC § 103

The Office Action rejected Claim 3 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudwick (US 4,280,581) in view of Hartman (US 4,770,433). Claim 3 depends from Claim 1 which the Applicant believes to now be in condition for allowance. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 3 and advance Claim 3 to allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 5, 67, and 71 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudwick (US 4,280,581) in view of Eguchi (US 6,320,336). Claims 5, 67, and 71 depend from Claim 1. Because the Applicant believes that the herein amended Claim 1 is in condition for allowance, the Applicant also believes that Claims 5, 67, and 71 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that Claims 5, 67, and 71 and for be advanced to allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claim 70 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudwick (US 4,280,581). Claim 70 depends from Claim 1 which the Applicant believes to now be in condition for allowance. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 70 and advance Claim 70 to allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claim 79 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudwick (US 4,280,581). Claim 79 is herein amended to include a motor sprocket rotationally fixed to said rotatable assembly of said motor at all times in clockwise and counterclockwise rotation, thus always turning at the same angular velocity as the motor. For the reasons cited above for the allowance of Claim 1, the Applicant also believes that the herein amended Claim 79 is also in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 79 and advance Claim 79 to allowance.

CONCLUSIONS

Claims 1-5 and 67-81 remain pending in the application. Claims 1 and 79 have been amended to clearly describe the differences between the present invention and Rudwick. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner advance Claims 1-5 and 67-81 to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

// K. L. Green //

Kenneth L. Green
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 44,724

Averill & Varn
8244 Painter Avenue
Whittier, CA 90602
(562) 698-8039